DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 386 CG 027 262

AUTHOR Hyman, Irwin A.; And Others
TITLE The Enemy within: Tales of Punishment Politics and Prevention.
INSTITUTION Temple Univ., Philadelphia, Pa. National Center for the Study of Corporal Punishment and Alternatives in the Schools.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual National Convention of School Psychologists (Atlanta, GA, March 12-16, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Corporal Punishment; Discipline; *Discipline Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Negative Reinforcement; Public Opinion; *Public Policy; Punishment; *School Policy; *Social Attitudes; Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

In 1994, about 60 to 70% of Americans supported parental spanking. This paper examines student misbehavior, school discipline, prevention, treatment, and punishment in U.S. society Currently, 23 states still allow paddling in schools, and most states do not allow the spanking of foster children. As of 1994, all but a few of the national organizations representing children had taken a stand against corporal punishment in the schools, and some, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, were reconsidering their positions on parental spanking. Even so, Americans' punitive public policy toward misbehavior, deviance, and non-conformity portrays a society which prefers solutions based on punishment rather than prevention and rehabilitation. Schools have to struggle with punitive, scientifically discredited, and outmoded approaches to problems of student misbehavior, partly because of public policies and legislation. It should also be expected that educators likewise reflect the punitive attitudes of society. But conditions are changing and many policy makers have recognized the causes of misbehavior and violence and are working to address these conditions. Child abuse laws, protection from spousal abuse, drug treatment programs, juvenile justice, and the schools have gradually moved away from the United States' punitive roots. Contains 85 references. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 397 386

The Enemy Within: Tales of Punishment Politics and Prevention**

Irwin A. Hyman
Erica Weiler Donna Perone Lori Romano
Gretchen Britton

National Center for the Study of Corporal Punishment and Alternatives
Temple University

In 1976, when I first became actively involved in research, advocacy and litigation regarding corporal punishment(cp), two states and scattered local school districts forbad its use in schools. At that time, I predicted to colleagues on an American Psychological Association Task Force on Corporal Punishment in the Schools that a concerted national effort should end cp in America within at least ten years. Senior members of the task force good naturedly humored my naivete. I didn't have the foggiest notion about the depth and breath of Americans' punitiveness toward children and youth.

Initial research, clinical evaluations and testimony in courts and legislative groups on school cp inevitably led to an expanded agenda. The result is that I engaged in professional specialties that I didn't even know existed. I entered the worlds of victimology and traumatology. I began to see how schools

---

** Paper presented at the 1996 Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, Atlanta, GA, March 15, 1996. Parts of this paper are from A. Goldstein and J. Conoley, (Eds.)(in press). The School Violence Intervention Handbook.New York: Guilford; I. Hyman, A. Dahbany, M. Blum, V. Brooks-Klein, E. Weiler and M. Pokalo (in press). School Discipline and School Violence: The Teacher Variance Approach, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon; and a Paper presented at the Invitational Conference on the Short and Long Term Consequences of Corporal Punishment, sponsored by the American Academy of Pediatrics and United States Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Chicago, IL, Feb. 9, 1996.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
I. HYMAN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CG027262

truly mirror the values and traditions of communities and regions. Most disturbing, as I became more deeply involved in individual school cases of physical and psychological maltreatment of students, I began to realize that I was dealing with two distinct sets of adversaries in the struggle to bring school policy in line with behavioral and social science research about student misbehavior, school discipline, prevention, treatment and punishment. I identified the "enemies without" and the "enemies within."

This paper is about the enemies within, but let me first address the enemies without and offer an example of a case in Georgia which illustrates my point.

The Enemy Without-America the Punitive

The enemy without is the faith of Americans regarding the value of punishment. Many acts of child abuse begin with the precept that verbal and physical assaults on children are necessary to change behavior. Many people consider that the more intense the pain, the less likely misbehavior will be repeated (Axelrod, 1984; Bongiovanni, 1979). For instance, in the campaign against corporal punishment in schools, it has become clear that too many Americans are obsessively punitive. Punitiveness includes overt acts in which physical or psychological pain are inflicted and acts of omission which result in painful, psychologically destructive conditions in homes, schools and in society.

American punitive public policy toward misbehavior, deviance and non-conformity suggests that we are a nation which prefers solutions based on punishment rather than prevention and rehabil-

itation. This attitude mitigates against any meaningful prevention of problems such as child abuse, delinquency or school violence (McCord, 1991; Patterson, Capaldi & Bank, 1990; Straus, 1994). Covert punishment by legislative neglect is a type of punitiveness which affects the lives of millions of American children in inadequately funded schools. For instance, in schools serving poor children, meager resources are often used to provide services after misbehavior and violence occurs, rather than to offer comprehensive prevention programs.

When relative wealth and potential resources are taken into account, we are probably the most punitive country among the Western democracies (Children's Defense Fund, 1991; Hodgkinson, 1991; National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse, 1991a,1991b; The National Commission on Children 1991; Hyman & Pokalo, 1992). The source of our punitiveness is a cluster of beliefs nurtured by the authoritarian right (Altemeyer, 1988; Barnhart, 1972; Jones, Gasiewski, & Hyman, 1990; Hyman, 1990; Miller, 1980). The justification for our punitiveness toward children lies deeply embedded in religion and tradition (Greven, 1980,1991; Jones, Gasiewski & Hyman, 1990; Pokalo, 1986; Wiehe, 1989).

The results of our punitiveness are evidenced by comparison with other Western democracies (Hyman, 1995). We have (1) high infant mortality rates, (2) a low percentage of Gross National Product spent on education (Hedges, Laine & Greenwald, 1994), (3) a relatively poor record of providing programs and services for schooling and employing the disabled, (4) the highest rate of incarceration and execution of people who committed crimes as

juveniles, (5) very poor legislative support for families in terms of provisions of programs such as day care, family leave, sick leave, and vacations (National Commission on Children, 1991), (6) expended great resources to punish unauthorized talk, pictures, objects and thoughts of sex, although we still have the highest teen-age pregnancy rates (our rates are twice as high as England, Wales, France and Canada; three times as high as Sweden; and seven times as high as the Netherlands), and (7) we continue in a fruitless "war on drugs" which emphasizes levels of punishment, as opposed to treatment and prevention, which have resulted in jammed courts and overflowing jails.

Southern Traditions?

Currently, 27 states have abolished cp in their schools by either legislative action, state department of education rules or banning by all school districts. We have now hit a wall of resistence from Southern and rural states. I should probably not pick on any particular region, especially when I am enjoying the hospitality of Atlanta, a symbol of the new South, since my own state of PA has not abolished cp. This is true even though over 3/4 of the schools report not using it. However, as a largely rural state, many of our legislators are not that different than those in many Southern states. That is, they are quite conservative and resistant to changes in traditional beliefs which are often rooted in Biblical phrases, such as Solomon's admonition to not " spare the rod." The fact is that the final, strongest resistence to abolishing cp in schools is in the Southern and Southwestern states. Support for their resistence resides, at least in part, in local and state judicial systems.

Actually, I have particular motive to castigate the legal system of Georgia, and since I am here, why not? Judges Banke, Sognier and Pope of the Court of Appeals of Georgia rendered a decision in Feb. 1989, that is probably one of the most egregious opinions in contemporary jurisprudence. The case involved Chris Mathis, a 13 year old, 5th grader who was severely paddled by his teacher. Four licks with a wooden paddle, approximately 24 " long, 6" wide and 1" thick, left deep red bruises which were damaging enough that pictures of them clearly show the outline of the paddle.

This young man, who had a severe learning disability that the Berrian County Schools had not identified, was paddled for laughing in class and telling a girl who had told him to "shut up" to "shut up yourself." The source of his "offense" was that he was reading orally, but softly to himself, as he had been instructed by his reading teacher.

Without going into all the detąils of the case, he was so severely bruised that his physician told his mother to issue an arrest warrant against the teacher. The leaders, bureaucrats and power brokers of Berrian County, Georgia saw to it that Chris' family was rendered impotent in their attempts top seek redress through local government. Only the help of a small law firm, Russell & Herrera, from Decatur, enabled the Mathis family to file against the school. There case was rejected by the local court. They appealed and discovered how the judicial system failed, not only to protect them, but set precedent for future beatings by teachers.

The honorable judges in their rejection of the parents appeal by a lower court's summary judgment against their case said that this beating, that clearly met medical standards for abuse, was permissible since it was done by a teacher, "inasmuch as it is to be anticipated that corporal punishment will produce pain and the potential for bruising."

Now, in this case, given the level of pain, the extent of the bruises, the treatment of the family and the Georgia judicial system's attitude, why would future parents of abused children even think they would get their day in court? Further, why would most attorneys be willing to accept school abuse cases, except if the clients were willing to offer a hefty retainer. This likelihood is minimal, since the children of affluent families are rarely beaten by educators. In fact, I can guarantee few, if any children of executives from Pepsi-cola, or even children of Newt Gingrich, have ever received a paddling by their teachers, let alone a severe beating. Since most students who are beaten are from poor families, there is little incentive for attorneys to take these types of cases on a contingency basis.

Spanking in the Home

Because of a conservative political climate and perceived high rates of crime, both school and parental spanking are again beginning to attract impassioned attention.

Even though school and parental cp is declining, at least 90% of our population have experienced it and the rest have been exposed to it. Our perceptions of appropriateness and efficacy of cp are correlated with the frequency, intensity, duration and context of how we experienced it as children. We are also in-

fluenced by our political orientation, religion, family traditions, regional attitudes and level of education (Hyman, 1990).

In our current economic and political climate, political "get tough" rhetoric is a sure vote getter and prevention and treatment based policies are neglected or rejected. For example, these beliefs frame the emerging controversy over the relationship between corporal punishment and child abuse. Conservatives tend to support cp in most settings and claim it is distinct from and not related to abuse. Most liberals, and child abuse organizations, are against cp and perceive spanking and other types of cp as points on an abuse continuum. Liberals have used research findings, training in effective alternatives, media blitzes and tort litigation to help eliminate school cp in politically liberal or moderate states. However, there is not enough adequate research on "normal" spanking to convince most Americans, even in these same states, to abandon the practice. Unlike school cp, parental spanking has ominous implications which may impede an appropriate research agenda and change in attitudes.

If spanking is related to abuse, would that mean that most Americans, when they hit their children, are abusers? Wouldn't this include most of our parents? Clearly, many people survive spankings, and even abuse, and become productive citizens. While most researchers agree that excessive cp is deleterious, some studies show that even low levels of cp in the home or school may have lifetime negative effects on personality.

Court Mandated Paddlings

Our dilemma is plainly reflected in citizen reaction and political rhetoric associated with the flogging of an American

adolescent in Singapore. In a Newsweek poll following the initial publicity, 38% of the respondents approved of the public flogging of an American citizen by an authoritarian regime (Elliot, 1994). I have suggested that those who don't understand the facts, suffer from the "Singapore Syndrome." This disease is common to right wing politicians who call for a return to flogging of children and youth for minor delinquent behaviors.

Several months ago, the California House of Representatives considered legislation, which the Governor had promised to sign, which would have permitted paddling of youths convicted of graffiti. They were also considering re-instating cp in schools. Both bills were defeated, especially after supporters were asked to defend the legality of paddlings which were depicted in pictures I provided to child advocates who opposed the legislation. These picture included one of the battered buttocks of Chris Mathis, the boy from Georgia whom I mentioned earlier. While pictures of his bruised behind didn't convince the Georgia Court of Appeals, it did help save California youth from similar fates.

It is quite clear that powerful elements in our society, as illustrated in Georgia case of Chris Mathis and the legislative considerations in California, are able to prevent us as a nation to join almost all of the other Western democracies in abolishing school cp and renouncing the infliction of pain on children in the name of learning, obedience and under color of law. This problem of American punitiveness will be illustrated throughout this presentation as we consider official reactions student misbehavior. Without changes in our Nation's attitudes, the schools will continue to fail to adequately handle student al-

ienation, disruption and violence. The "enemy without" is us but we are also part of the "enemy within."

The Enemy Within - Is it Ourselves?

Through the 19th century, American educators relied heavily on corporal punishment and humiliation to foster achievement and maintain order. Teachers were often neither educators, instructors, nor trainers. They were valued as disciplinarians who specialized in the use of the rod and cowskin, the ruler and switches (Finkelstein, 1989). Discipline, based on fear, resulted in the prominent display of paddles, switches, quinces, and even whipping posts (Hyman & Wise, 1979). In the words of an Oregon teacher, these instruments of discipline "were silent but forceful admonitions to potentially disruptive students" (Finkelstein, 1989). The crucible for violence against authority may well have existed in the punitive atmosphere of Puritan society from which flowed violent solutions.

Now, I know that NASP, APA and NEA, to name a few national organizations, are against cp in schools. Despite this, about 1/2 of the states still approve of it. This generally means that the educational establishment in those state does not want to see it abolished. We as school psychologists, especially those at the local level, have an ethical and professional responsibility to present articulate, data based, advocacy driven positions against the use of cp in schools and to be proactive about the other punishment driven, destructive practices I discuss in this presentation. We know that prevention, reward, positive motivation and treatment are the best ways to deal with misbehavior. I believe that if we are not proactive, we are truly part of the

enemy within.

Some Good News and Bad News

The good news is that we have made progress in schools and homes in some areas. But, for instance, even though school and parental cp is declining, at least 90% of our population has had some personal experience with it and the rest have been exposed to it indirectly (Straus, & Mathur, 1994). Our perceptions of appropriateness and efficacy of cp are correlated with the frequency, intensity, duration and context of how we experienced it as children (Barrish, 1996; Hyman, 1990; Kaplan, 1995). We are also influenced by our political orientation, religion, family traditions, regional attitudes and level of education (Hyman, 1990; Straus, 1994).

The bad news is that given the predictors of attitude toward cp described above, why should one posit that anyone, including school psychologists would be immune from biases about cp? Research strongly suggests that professionals' beliefs and researchers' methodologies and interpretations of data about cp are colored by their personal experiences. Individual demographics such as religion, regionality, and political orientations shape how we interpret data, explain clinical experiences and react publicly to the issue.

Given the above, why should one posit that anyone, including physicians, behavioral scientists or policy makers would be immune from biases about cp? Individual demographics such as religion, regionality, and political orientations shaped how we interpreted data, explained clinical experiences and reacted to various research designs (Kaplan, 1995). For instance, let con-

sider how psychologists view the issue of corporal punishment in general.

Psychologists Attitudes About Corporal Punishment

A random sample of psychologists from four divisions of the American Psychological Association were surveyed by Kaplan (1995) in 1994. Results of the survey revealed that 31% of respondents recommended parental use of corporal punishment. This finding is similar to that of Ragsdale (1994), whose survey of members of the APA Division of Children, Youth, and Families and Division of Clinical Psychology indicated that 30% "would suggest a spank "rarely" or "sometimes." Kaplan's study indicated that over 75% of the respondents opposed or strongly opposed the use of corporal punishment and that 55% believed spanking is an abusive act while 8% felt it is child abuse. Yet, 48% reported having used corporal punishment on their own children. Ragsdale's study, with similar results to those of Kaplan, showed that although 70% of psychologists would never recommend that a parent spank a child, 62% reported slapping or spanking their own child more than once.

Kaplan found that females were more likely to oppose the use of corporal punishment than males. Other predictors of opposition were being raised in higher socio-economic classes than on lower SES, Jewish religious orientation as compared to Protestant orientation and never having received corporal punishment at home as a child. Psychologists who perceived the corporal punishment they received as a child as helpful were more likely to support and recommend the use of corporal punishment than those who perceived it as harmful, regardless of how severe the punish-

ment

So, here we are dealing with the crucible of training in violence, hitting in homes and schools, as a solution to misbehavior and we ourselves don't act so rationally. While other educators may have an excuse, why aren't all school psychologists quietly, and not so quietly, campaigning against cp in any setting, but especially the schools?

Other Types of School Maltreatment

The purpose of the rest of this presentation is to offer an explication, highlighted by case histories drawn from my clinical and forensic experiences, of the problem of punitiveness in our schools and what some educators and many educational policies do to deter prevention and remediation of student misbehavior. These cases illustrate the moral, ethical and economic dilemmas faced by practicing school psychologists who must deal with both overt and covert maltreatment of students. I do not mean to suggest that we have the power to change policy on our own, or that we are the direct cause of many of the schools' problems. But, I present this information to suggest that, as individuals, we need to be more openly proactive. I say this as a reflection of my observation that in almost all of the cases of student maltreatment with which I have been involved as an expert witnesses, I rarely heard from or about the local school psychologist. In some cases, when I tried to initiate contact, it was obvious that the local psychologists couldn't or wouldn't function as advocates for the student victims or their families. Have no doubt about it, this is dangerous territory for school psychologists in some areas to tread. Especially since it is so intertwined with the

whole issues of students rights and our contemporary concern about school violence. Therefore, I will turn to a brief discussion of the problem of school violence and how it currently colors our advocacy efforts.

In the following I suggest that (1) the public's perception of the extent of school crime is an over-estimation of reality, (2) this over-concern results from conservative, "law and order" politicians' scare tactics supporting calls for "get tough policies," a technique which has historically been used to earn votes and reman in power, (3) these tactics are aided and abetted by the media, (4) distorted perceptions of the extent and severity of school violence encourages educators to reject research and practice which demonstrate the success of well run and well supported prevention and treatment programs and (5) the ensuing atmosphere only encourages punitive approaches which in most cases create, rather than cure student violence, alienation and disruption (Hyman, 1995).

After establishing that student generated violence is not as bad as is perceived by most citizens, we consider various aspects of staff victimization of students. We begin with an overview of the use of corporal punishment as it impacts on schools' roles in dealing with both routine and severe misbehavior. We then turn to educators' emotional maltreatment of students. We first consider routine verbal maltreatment. We then review the emotional impact on students of strip searches and the use of undercover agents in schools. These two practices are promoted by some in dealing with school based crime associated with drugs. Finally, we discuss the emotional effects of teacher and peer sexual

victimization, too often either ignored or covertly and subtly approved by school staff. This type of victimization may also lead to the development of attitudes and behaviors which result in student alienation and misbehavior.

The Problem of School Violence

Historians say that disorder and violence have been intrinsic to European, English and American schools for centuries. For example, school children in seventeenth century France were often armed, feared by their schoolmates and ordinary citizens alike (Aries, 1962). It was not uncommon for French students to engage in duels, brawls, mutinies, and beatings of teachers. In English public schools, between 1775 and 1836, mutinies, strikes and violence were frequent. These uprisings were sometimes so severe that school masters sought intervention by the military (Newman, 1980). American schools also have had a history of violence, including attacks on teachers by both students and parents (Finkelstein, 1989). Although student misbehavior involving sex, drugs, gambling and violence was common among children throughout the centuries; what has steadily increased is public concern over these behaviors (American Psychological Association, 1993; Moles, 1990).

How Bad is the Problem

The landmark research on school violence was the Safe School Study (National Institute of Education, 1978), which represented one of the earliest attempts to study school violence systematically. Despite grave public concerns about school violence during the 1970's, the study revealed relatively low increases in school violence in the early 1970's and then a

tapering off toward the end of the decade. For instance, data revealed that percentages of teachers who were victims of violence in 1956 were 1.6%, 1972 were 2.2%, 1974 were 3.0% and 1976 were 2.9%.

Media hype has historically depicted schools as extremely dangerous places. Rubel (1977) tracked the number of articles about school violence which appeared in the New York Times between 1960 and 1975. The data suggest that relatively small actual increases may result in disproportional increases in media coverage. A recent unpublished study by two of my doctoral students, Maria Ganci and Richa Kleiman, investigated reports of school violence in the New York Times from 1990 to 1995. During this period, with the exception of 1993, the number of articles which discussed policy far outweighed articles about actual school crime incidents. This phenomena is likely to influence readers to have exaggerated perceptions of the amount of school crime.

While we do not deny that any amount of school disruption and violence is a problem, historical and contemporary data do not indicate dramatic increases in recent years. Crimes like student victimization have remained relatively stable from 1980 to 1992. Despite public perceptions, in 1993, data compiled by the U.S. Department of Education, indicated that within a twelve month period, 44% of teachers reported that student misbehavior interfered substantially with their teaching; 23% of 8th graders were involved in serious student fights; 19% of teachers verbally abused (previous 4 weeks); 12% of teachers feared for their safety; 8% of teachers threatened with bodily harm; 2% of teachers were physically attacked. Teachers in urban schools are much

more likely to be victimized than are those in suburban and rural settings (National Center for Education Statistics, 1992).

Most crime data is dependent on reporting by victims or witnesses and accuracy of crime statistics is a problem. Taking this into consideration, the data we have examined indicate modest fluctuations of school violence over the last several decades. Large increases in youth crime, especially as reported in the media, may be artifacts of reporting procedures. Increases may reflect new categories of offenses (such as carrying beepers in schools) or increased activity by police to arrest certain types of offenders. Or they may be reflect rising levels of unrest related of social problems in certain segments of the population. For instance, there is little doubt that increased gang activity related to growing demands for drugs and the easy availability of guns resulted in a large jump in fatalities due to firearms by youth in inner cities.

Despite the actual data on school crime, conservative politicians have historically used law-and order, get tough rhetoric to scare the public into voting for them. Lets take a look at how dangerous schools really are and then consider the other side of the coin.

Schools as Safe Havens

In response to public rhetoric about school crime, we conducted a systematic examination of the data on the relative dangers in schools and found that schools are one of the safest institutions for children and youth (Hyman, Olbrich & Shanock, 1994).

The Criminal Victimization in the United States Reports

(U.S. Department of Justice, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994) indicate that rape, robbery, and assault are more likely to occur in the home than in school.

Homes are actually one of the most dangerous places for children. In 1992, 91% of the approximately 2.9 million abused or neglected children were victimized by family members (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1994). This resulted in 1068 deaths in 44 reporting States (The National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse estimates 1,260 deaths nationwide).

Even in some of the most violent cities, children are safer in schools. In 1991, the aggravated assault rate in Chicago, a highly violent city, was 1502 per 100,000 citizens while in 1992, the public school rate was 325/100,000 (Chicago Public Schools, The Bureau of Safety and Security, 1994).

Comparison of Violence in Schools to Other Settings

In order to compare school/home/ other settings violence rates we began by examining some data on homicides.

In 1986-90 at least 71 persons were killed with guns at school (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1993). Even one death is too many, but when compared to homicides in other settings, schools are still relatively safe, even though there are pockets of high school violence.

Between the academic years of 1992 and 1993, the Los Angeles Public Schools reported three homicides. One of those deaths was accidental (Los Angeles Unified Public Schools-Department of Security, 1994). Los Angeles homicide rate for 1991 was 29.30/100,000 persons (California Department of Justice, Division of Law Enforcement (1993) and for the schools in 1992, it was

0.12/100,000.

School Responses to Violence

The problem of school violence is exacerbated when the same people calling for more "law and order" in schools often mask routine victimization of students by teachers and other school personnel (Hyman, 1995). Acquiescence, trivialization and cover-ups of student maltreatments can create a climate that increases student anger, aggression, violence and criminal behaviors. These issues are rarely discussed in the media, research on school violence and the most frequently used survey textbooks on school discipline (Blum, 1994). Yet, in a climate of increasing punitive responses to student misbehavior, even prevention approaches ignore data and emulate law enforcement rather than educational models.

Most contemporary violence prevention approaches include such methods as metal detectors, increased police presence in schools, uniformed or non-uniformed guards, student and staff I.D. cards, and forbidding beepers on school grounds. Punishment alternatives such as boot camps, wilderness camps, mandatory sentencing for drug offenses and adjudicating delinquents as if they were adults have been instituted. However, while these and similar measures may be necessary in some situations, they don't address the underlying issues, which involve attitudes of students and staff, school climate, social contracts and school discipline policies. Social scientists frequently, and often impotently, point out the lack of evidence for the success of most of these approaches. Despite this, programs shown not to reduce recidivism such as boot camps, continue to be funded

(American Psychological Association, 1993).

Studies of teachers and administrators suggest that discipline and school violence are important issues, but other matters such as lack of financial resources for school based programs, inadequate parenting of students, the culture of poverty, and student substance abuse are of equal or greater concern to school staff (Elam, 1989; Elam & Rose, 1995; Hyman & D'Allesandro, 1984; Moles, 1990). Yet, most polls fail to recognize the complex relationship between all of the above and the modeling of violence by teachers as is illustrated by the case of cp.

Corporal Punishment

I have already touched on cp here and have discussed it extensively elsewhere (Hyman, 1990). However, a few points might be considered.

As disciplinary procedures that directly inflict pain are varied, corporal punishment should be broadly defined to include unreasonable confinement in a restricted space (Hyman, 1989b), inappropriate uses of time-out, forcing children to assume fixed postures for unreasonable periods of time, excessive exercise and drills, forced ingestion of noxious substances and exposure to painful environments and/or psychological maltreatment which causes emotional pain. The data clearly demonstrate that the potential duration, intensity and frequency of psychological symptoms resulting from traumatic physical and psychological assaults by educators are the same (Hyman, 1990).

Teacher resistance to banning corporal punishment is often based on the argument that its use, or at least the threat of its use, is needed to stem student violence. However, all laws and

regulations regarding corporal punishment in schools protect educators' rights to use force to quell disturbances, and to protect themselves, others, property or students from self-injury. An educator is not liable for the incidental infliction of pain as a result of the legitimate use of any of the aforementioned. In any event, most hitting occurs in the lower grades (Hyman & Wise, 1979; Russell, 1988, 1989). Teachers and administrators rarely paddle big, strong, potentially violent students who could retaliate.

Psychological Maltreatment

Psychological maltreatment of student by educators is an issue which has received relatively little attention in schools and is not generally associated with misbehavior. In general, it takes many forms, including mental cruelty, sexual exploitation, allowing children to live in dangerous or unstable environments, encouraging or permitting children to use destructive drugs, providing negative and destructive role models, exposing children to systematic bias and prejudice, emotional neglect, and subjecting children to institutional practices which are clearly demonstrated to inhibit maintenance of basic human needs (Hart & Brassard, 1987). The latter occurs when children in schools do not receive appropriate human contact and attention because they are unattractive or because teachers are overburdened or burned out (Hart, 1987).

Studies conducted at the National Center for The Study of Corporal Punishment and Alternatives (NCSCPA) indicate that at least 50% to 60% of all school children suffer from at least one occurrence of maltreatment by an educator which leads to stress

symptoms (Lambert, Witkowski, Hyman, Alderman & Tucker, 1988; Lambert, 1990; Vargas-Moll, 1992; Zelikoff, 1990). About 1% to 2% develop symptoms of sufficient duration, intensity and frequency that they develop Posttraumatic Stress Disorder(PTSD).

While 1% to 2% might not seem to be a large percentage of a school age population, in a system like New York City, this would be about 10,000 children so traumatized by educators that they may suffer lifelong emotional problems. A good percentage of these develop angry and aggressive responses and are a pool of students whose misbehavior is created by the school. Yet, emotional abuse and its relation to misbehavior in schools receives little pedagogical, psychological or legal attention and is rarely mentioned in textbooks on school discipline (Pokalo & Hyman, 1993; Sarno, 1992).

Verbal assaults, ridicule and excessive criticism in classrooms often represent attempts by teachers to discipline or correct student misbehavior. These types of disciplinary excesses are often excused on the grounds that they are meant to correct and not harm students and that they are normal and accepted methods of motivating children (Hyman & D'Allessandro, 1984). For instance, sarcasm, name calling and ridicule may be done in a joking manner by a teacher or coach who is completely unaware of the damaging impact these acts might have on individual students. However, when faced with the reality, the educator may rationalize, insisting that the remark was not meant to harm the child. Or, the teacher might defend the act on the basis that most students "can take it." Besides being unaware of limits, abusers are often ignorant about appropriate disciplinary procedures

(Blum, 1994; Hyman & Lally, 1982; Pokalo, 1986).

Definitions of Emotional Maltreatment

Educators, legislatures, judges, child protective workers, clinicians and researchers have all attempted to define emotional abuse from their own perspectives (Brassard & Hart, 1989; Hyman & Weiler, 1994). There is some debate over the semantics of the terms "abuse" and "maltreatment." Abuse usually implies a crime of commission, whereas maltreatment may imply both commission and omission. However, the terms are used interchangeably here where we deal with the issue from the perspective of schools and classrooms.

Psychological maltreatment consists of (1) discipline and control techniques which are based on fear and intimidation, (2) low quantity of human interaction in which teachers communicate a lack of interest, caring and affection for students, (3) limited opportunities for students to develop adequate skills and feelings of self-worth, (4) encouragement to be dependent and subservient, especially in areas where students are capable of making independent judgments, and (5) denial of opportunities for healthy risk taking such as exploring ideas that are not conventional and approved by the teacher (Brassard, Hart & Germain 1987; Hyman, 1987).

Teachers may maltreat students by being over-demanding or perfectionistic with children who already have these traits as a result of parental pressure or self-demands. Obviously, the various practices which constitute psychological maltreatment conflict with the legal, moral and historical obligations of schools (Hart, Brassard & Germain, 1987).

Although psychological maltreatment is believed to occur more often than other forms of abuse, it is difficult to determine rate of occurrence in specific regions or schools, since schools are not anxious to investigate their own malfeasance. Our research on both physical and psychological abuse by educators suggests that maltreatment in general includes (1) verbal assault, (2) ridicule, (3) isolation and rejection, (4) punitive sanctions, (5) peer humiliation (6) sexual corruption and (7) physical assault(Hyman, 1990; Hyman, Zelikoff & Clarke, 1988).

There are some legal definitions of emotional maltreatment by teachers. Case law indicates that emotional distress, another term for emotional maltreatment, is a basis for civil litigation (Hyman, 1990; Hyman, Zelikoff & Clarke, 1988; Hyman & Weiler,1993; Pokalo & Hyman, 1993; Sarno, 1992). In most state education regulations, psychological maltreatment is either absent or not well defined. In states with statutes which forbid it, few cases of abuse are processed and even fewer are won by plaintiff students and their parents in tort litigation (Connecticut, 1993; Hart & Brassard, 1987; Pokalo & Hyman, 1993; Sarno, 1992.

Legal Implications

Connecticut has attempted to prevent emotional maltreatment in schools by including it as a forbidden activity in their code of professional standards for teachers (Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers, 1992). However, even here, translating a few sentences into legally binding operational definitions has not been accomplished. Transforming vague language into

effective legislative mandates requires consideration of three factors. The regulation/law must (1) define the act, (2) address the results(symptoms) in relation to the act, and (3) consider whether intention should limit culpability.

We have extensive data on the acts which constitute psychological maltreatment in schools and these can be relatively easily translated into legislative language. Further, we have clearly documented the range of student symptoms which result from maltreatment. The approach which we have used depends to a great extent on symptomology. Some may question a symptom based approach to studying psychological maltreatment. They may feel that direct observation is the most appropriate way to study the extent and effects of the problem. However, educators are unlikely to engage in questionable classroom practices while under observation.

We have found few schools willing to invite researchers to investigate the nature and extent of emotional damage their practices may cause children. In clinical evaluations involving litigation, we have found denial ranging from claims of ignorance of a teacher's abusive behavior to outright perjury. In these cases, observations by administrators, testimony by students and parents who support the abusing teacher, and character references are often biased and of little help in determining the impact of teachers on individual students (Pokalo & Hyman, 1993).

In cases where school authorities have documented symptoms and required abusive teachers to change their techniques, the schools have been successful in disciplining offending teachers (Pokalo & Hyman, 1993). So, whether school boards have been

plaintiffs or defendants, documentation of symptoms has been a successful method for amelioration and is amenable to translation into legislation.

The question of intention involves legal and psychological consideration. If a teacher claims that he/she did no intend to embarrass a student, is the teacher relieved of responsibility? There are numerous cases where the teacher claimed not to have any malicious intent, but the results were nevertheless devastating (Pokalo & Hyman, 1993). However, we think that proper training of teachers can sensitize most to the nature of psychological maltreatment.

Effects of Psychological Maltreatment

Studies of psychological maltreatment by caretakers indicate that pre-school and school-age maltreated children perform at lower levels than control children on measures of (1) ability, (2) academic achievement and (3) social competency (Brassard & Hart, 1989). Maltreated children also display more behavior problems, including aggression, and poor interpersonal competencies as rated by teachers (Sakowski, 1993). In addition, their feelings of inadequacy and resentment may lead to violence.

Our research on psychological maltreatment is based on school stressors identified by three samples who filled out our research instrument which is called the My Worst School Experience Survey (MWSES) (Hyman, 1990; Hyman, Zelikoff & Clarke, 1988; Lambert, 1990; Vargas-Moll, 1992) and clinical cases.

The three samples included teachers and other adults (Zelikoff, 1990), high school students from a middle class school (Lambert, 1990) and inner city Hispanic elementary school child-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ren (Vargas-Moll, 1991).

We have identified 100 specific psychological reactions to both physical and psychological maltreatment which are measured by MWSES (Hyman, 1990; Lambert, 1990; Lambert, Witkowski, Hyman, et al. 1988; Hyman, Zelikoff & Clarke, 1988; Zelikoff, 1990; Vargas-Moll, 1991;Vargas-Moll & Hyman, 1992). These include personality changes, avoidance (often of school, school work and the teachers who cause the problems), school problems, aggression, reexperiencing of the trauma, intrusive memories of the trauma, hypervigilence and other types of increased arousal and foreshortened sense of the future.

As with corporal punishment, the frequency of emotional maltreatment in schools is too often a function of SES of the school population (Hyman, 1990). Evidence suggests that poor children are at greater risk than are other children. However, high SES students are not immune from psychological abuse in schools (Hyman & Pokalo, 1993).

One study, using the MWSE scale on a total high school population, identified three clusters of stress symptoms; (1) reexperiencing the trauma, (2) school related problems and (3) increased arousal (Lambert, Witkowski, Hyman, Alderman & Tucker, 1988; Lambert, 1990). Research with the scale indicates seven symptom factors which are (1) depression /avoidance, (2) oppositional/defiant, (3) avoidant/hypervigilant, (4) somatic complaints, (5) reexperiencing and intrusive thoughts, (6) depression/hopelessness/suicidal ideation, and (7) disturbing dreams and memories (Berna, 1993; Berna & Hyman, 1993).

In summary, we believe that there is ample evidence that

psychological maltreatment in schools can be prevented. Clinical and anecdotal evidence suggests that a significant reduction could result in increases in learning, more satisfaction with school and a possible decrease in school violence. We have presented sufficient data to support legislative efforts. However, there are political and social reasons why this type of punitiveness may not be soon addressed in any significant manner.

Emotional Effects of Strip Searches

In addition to the maltreatment indicated in most of our research, students now being abusively strip searched. In 1985, in the case of New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985), the Supreme Court lowered the standard for permission of school districts to search students. As a result of this ruling, some school districts have been encouraged to increase the use of strip searches. Our clinical investigations of the victims of strip searches indicate that asking students to remove their clothes as part of disciplinary procedures can result in serious emotional damage. Interviews with parents and adolescents in a recent case (Tipper et al. v. New Castle, Pennsylvania Area School District, et al., 1993) indicated that many of the students who were stripped developed a loss of faith in the previously admired administrator who conducted this search, loss of interest in academics, depression and anger. In some students, tardiness and truancy increased and fantasies of revenge were harbored.

As educators, police and the public have become more alarmed by the use of weapons and drugs in schools, there has been increasing interest and use of detection procedures including unintrusive means such as metal detectors and highly intrusive

strip searches (Stefkovich, 1993a). This later procedure had in the past been considered to be too intrusive for school settings and was thought to be a violation of students' Constitutional rights. However, when the Supreme Court ruled in the case of New Jersey v. T.L.O.(1985), students' privacy rights in schools were eroded (Stefkovich, 1993b). While the case itself involved the search of a student's purse for cigarettes, the ruling lowered students' general privacy rights so that their protections from search and seizure are now less than those afforded most citizens. However, even though the Court lowered the standard for student searches (Dise, Dyer & Debler, 1995; Stefkovich, 1993a, 1993b), it is clear from past precedents, recent cases and the dissenting views of Justice Stewart in T.L.O., that educators do not have free reign to conduct strip students for minor offenses.

In the last four years, we have been directly involved in four cases of strip searches which ranged geographically from Pennsylvania to Hawaii. They were quite similar in terms of officials' attitudes and actions and students' emotional responses. While this is hardly a large number of cases, it is more than we have dealt with in the preceding 15 year period. Further, as we have learned from our research on corporal punishment, small numbers of cases rising to the level of litigation and public attention usually indicate many more cases in which parents do not have the will, resources or desire to litigate or go public.

One case involved a mass strip search in which many, but not all of the students had previous histories of learning and behavioral problems. Despite previous problems of oppositional

behavior in most of these students, and alleged parental abuse in one case, most of the victims had clear increases in hostility toward the school and extreme anger toward the individuals involved in the searches, even though some were previously trusted and respected school staff. Several of the students were clearly headed toward more severe conduct problems as a result of the experience.

In one case, a 13 year old, female honor student dropped out of the public school where the search took place, entered a private school where she couldn't adjust, received poor grades and two years later developed all the symptoms of oppositional defiant disorder. In this case, the student passed a boys wallet back to him in class. It was found on the floor by a peer who was sitting next to her. The boy accused both girls of stealing ten dollars from the wallet. Based on this accusation, these girls, with no histories of misbehavior, were strip searched. As in most cases like this, no money was found.

The procedures for evaluating the emotional impact of strip searches are the same as for other types of school victimization. Before seeing the student, we review school records, previous clinical and academic evaluations, evaluate the student's responses on the My Worst School Experience scale and the parents responses on the Stress Response Scale (Chandler, 1983). They respond twice, indicating how the student was before and after the incident. We have found this later procedure quite useful in determining proximate cause of the stress symptoms (Trudel, 1994). If preliminary evaluation suggests serious enough stress symptoms which could support a diagnosis of PTSD, we then con-

duct a complete clinical assessment.

In individual cases we usually find serious symptomology and rarely do we have reason to suspect malingering. This is based on the fact that the students' symptoms generally need to be quite disturbing to them and their families. Further, the parents outrage must be sufficient for them to fight the school. This takes a lot of drive, since families and students frequently experience hostile reactions from neighbors, peers and members of the community who identify with school authorities. Many sympathize with educators whom they perceive to be dealing every day with unruly students and coddling parents. Early on, litigating parents recognize the schools' potential ability to harass them and their children. As a result, many parents probably drop their complaints and we never hear about or from them.

In one case, seven adolescents were strip searched because a student report that one of the group had passed marijuana to the others. Clinical screening revealed varying emotional reactions. All developed some stress symptoms, but two developed severe symptomology which rose to the level of PTSD. The more severe stress responses included, refusal to go back to school, ruminations about revenge, intrusive thoughts about the incident, loss of faith in school staff who were once trusted, increased tendency towards either avoidance and withdrawal or aggression and increased anger. These behaviors spilled over into the homes and caused parental consternation. These symptoms may last long enough to result in withdrawal from school and delinquent behavior.

There are virtually no social science data on strip search-

es. A survey of school administrators in Pennsylvania (White and Hyman, 1994) was conducted for legislators considering a bill on the practice. While the response rate of 21% was low, this study gives some insights about how principals view the topic.

Twenty-nine percent of the respondents indicated that their school allowed strip searches. During the previous school year administrators reported 89 cases of strip searches, with the major cause being searches for drugs, followed by searches for money, jewelry and other reportedly stolen items.

In determining what was appropriate in a school setting, 52% indicated that it was OK to require removal of shoes and socks and as more and more items for removal were listed, only about 3% approved of removal of all clothes. Most respondents were clearly confused about constitutionality and personal liability involved in searches.

While 90% of the respondents agree, in the abstract, that students should be protected from unwarranted invasions of privacy and 50% felt that strip searches were an invasion of privacy, only 50% saw the practice as potentially emotionally damaging. It appears that many judgments about the efficacy, advisability and potential harm of the practice revolved around uncertainty about legal and procedural issues regarding liability.

As far as we know, there are no data available regarding the success of strip searches. Our respondents reported an average of about 13% successes for drugs to about 50% for weapons. Success is not defined well in terms of type of search. For instance, some weapons are easily seen or felt and therefore there is little need to be very intrusive, especially if they are in the

students pockets. However, small amounts of drugs may be easily concealed in underwear or even body cavities, thereby requiring very intrusive searches. Our personal observations suggest that intrusive strip searches in which students are required to remove most or all of their clothing are generally not very successful and tend to cause the greatest emotional damage.

In conclusion, recent court rulings and fears about drugs, weapons and theft in school have resulted in increased willingness by school authorities to conduct intrusive searches that were previously taboo. While in dangerous situations these procedures may be warranted, this changing practice has serious potential for undermining student morale and emotionally damaging students. Further, use of these tactics has the potential for changing students' perceptions of school staff from caregivers/educators to policemen/enforcers. Taken to an extreme, in the eyes of adolescents, this translates to beliefs that school authorities can not be trusted and are in fact the embodiment of the adult enemy of teen culture. Anecdotal evidence and clinical data suggest this increases rationalizations for vandalism, aggression and violence in schools.

The Emotional Impact of Undercover Agents in Schools

Fear of youth crime spilling over into schools and the potential for using schools to gather intelligence about criminal behavior have led some local police agencies to use undercover agents in schools. As in the case of strip searches, this intrusion of police procedures into the schools has the potential to cause serious emotional harm to students, and may engender misbehavior, aggression and violence. Let us briefly consider the

activities of one agent, on the public payroll, who managed to sexually abuse two adolescent female students.

Ken, a twenty-two year freelance undercover agent was hired by local law enforcement authorities investigate gang activities in two small districts in a mostly rural Western state. He was employed under contract despite his history of emotional problems and minimal training. He was to work under the supervision of the county sheriff and local police.

In the first case, posing as a rebellious malcontent, he moved into the community with his authoritarian, abusive father. Ken ingratiated himself with Pat a 15 year old, tall, slim attractive, blond student with a history of depression, physical abuse, an eating disorder and some learning problems. Ken attempted to win favor with her family while he proceeded to seduce Pat with promises of everlasting love and devotion. Pat's father didn't trust him and the relationship caused family strife.

Ken used Pat to gain access to her friends and attempted to uncover an alleged drug ring. In the process, he convinced her to file false charges of sexual abuse against her father so that she was removed from the home and was easily accessible to Ken's sexual advances.

Ken never really produced any substantive arrests or convictions before he was exposed as an undercover agent. After Ken was exposed, Pat, who by this time was estranged from friends and family, felt abused emotionally and sexually. Ken was never properly supervised nor monitored, and even though Pat's parents brought charges against him, he was able to immediately move on to another undercover contract.

In his new assignment, Ken targeted June, another 15 year old student who quite closely resembled Pat. She also had many of the same problems. Following his previous modis operendi, Ken attempted to ingratiate himself with June's family. He attended family functions and often stayed overnight in their home.

When his identity was revealed, June's parents were incredulous to find out that he had recently been charged with sexually corrupting another minor in another school district. They sued the authorities, whom they claim must have known about his history.

In both cases the girls were devastated to discover that their new-found boyfriend had lied continually about himself and his feelings for them and then sexually and emotionally used them for his own ends. Because of Ken, both girls were estranged for a time from their families and friends and were the subjects of intense gossip in their small communities. Both dropped out of school and went through bouts of depression. They harbored intense anger and desires for revenge against authorities.

As a result of litigation by both families, I (Hyman) was asked to complete comprehensive evaluations of both girls and their reconciled families. In both cases the girls were seriously depressed and were diagnosed with PTSD. Symptoms revealed on the My Worst School Experience Scale indicated withdrawal, avoidance of school, repeated memories of events related to their seductions, foreshortened sense of the future, lowered self-esteem, depression, extreme anger and potential life-long distrust of authorities. Since both had dropped out of school, they went

through a series of part time, dead-end jobs. One got involved for several months with an abusive boyfriend. Without the full support of their families, some counseling and the sustaining faith that the litigation would bring them some relief, both girls could easily have turned toward anti-social behavior.

Because of some of the assertions by attorneys for the defense, especially that undercover investigations are widely used and acceptable, we searched the literature. We found this claim to be unsubstantiated and then conducted an informal, national investigation to determine the extent and types of undercover operations currently employed.

In a national phone survey of police and school officials in 42 responding states, we found 56 respondents who reported to familiarity with, or use of, undercover agents in schools. At the federal level, most officials had little or no information about covert activities in the schools. Most respondents in the states reported that they were not involved in these types of operations. Those who had experience with undercover operations were generally quite evasive about providing information, especially about the efficacy of the procedure. All were well aware of the potential for illegal sexual conduct with students and the potential emotional harm that this could cause young people.

The respondents who claimed not to use the procedure noted (1) poor effectiveness, (2) problems of monitoring agents, (3) lack of youthful appearing, trained officers, (4) reluctance to use students as agents, (5) failures to arrest anyone but students who are small-time pushers and often users themselves, (6) lack of cooperation from school principals, (7) public suspicion

of covert operations involving students, and (8) temptations by agents to become sexually involved with students and to identify with student culture. Civil liberties groups were especially concerned about the breach of school authority and autonomy at institutions which should promote learning in a psychologically safe atmosphere, and in which all authorities should be familiar with the vulnerability of youth.

Educators who would not allow undercover agents in their schools cited the potential for student paranoia and distrust of school staff which would undermine the learning atmosphere. They were concerned that a breach of the wall separating educators from law enforcement might undermine traditional democratic values in the schools.

Supporters of undercover work claim it helps "round up" many students at once, it sometimes enables arrests of others in the surrounding community and if it is successful, it slows down or prevents drug use by those arrested. Officials in big cities with extensive experience claim that agents must be highly trained and closely monitored, students must not be invited to their homes and agents should not be provocateurs. These officials feel the some programs have been successful, but could or would not provide any data to support their contentions. Further, a review of national crime reporting data did not provide any information about the efficacy of these programs.

Our the literature and our small national survey suggest that the use of undercover agents in schools can only be justified in extreme situations where there is a strong likelihood of significant arrests for major crimes. Currently, most of the

undercover activities we discovered are related to drug use and sales, ending in the arrest of student drug users. We believe that well informed school staff usually know who is using drugs and have information about much of what undercover agents want to know. Counselors and psychologists can be much more effective in the long run when provided with sufficient resources for programs of prevention, intervention and treatment for at-risk students.

In conclusion, the potential for abuse is just too great to justify most undercover operations. The ensuing emotional damage to individual students, the threat to student and staff morale, the lack of demonstrated cost effectiveness, the erosion of student's Constitutional rights and the possible retaliation by students against peers and school staff who are identified as "narcs, " are all reasons to avoid this practice.

Sexual Harassment in Schools

The problem of sexual harassment came to the foreground in the early 1990's as a result of Senate Hearings in which Anita Hill accused Justice Clarence Thomas, nominee for the Supreme Court, of sexual harassment. While that event raised public consciousness and resulted in corrective actions in many settings, few schools have adequately addressed the problem, especially within the context of overall discipline policy. In schools, as in other settings, a victim of sexual harassment is still likely to be blamed, rather than perceived as an unwilling participant.

Sexual harassment is a disciplinary problem because it creates a hostile learning environment in which victims may become fearful, anxious, withdrawn, angry or suffer severe loss

of self-esteem. Their lack of faith in the ability of school authorities' ability to protect them may result in lower academic performance, retaliation, withdrawal from school or acceptance of their role as sexual victims. Considering its extent, the problem is poorly addressed. As one fifteen year old girl reported, "Teachers and other students can do it and students don't want to say anything. If I complain to my classmates they will think that I'm full of myself. There's no point."

The inability of many schools to address issues of teenage sexuality explains why sexual harassment in the schools was not acknowledged as a problem until recently. In the past, such unwanted activities as flirting, sexually suggestive comments and touching were seen as an inevitable consequence of having males and females attend school or work together. Many believed that men should not to be held responsible for their behavior when they were in close proximity to women. Therefore, sexual harassment, especially in schools, was considered a trivial matter, explained away by the belief that "boys will be boys." This type of thinking excused the need to examine the issue of sexual harassment, especially as a school disciplinary problem.

What is sexual harassment and how widespread is it in our schools? We define sexual harassment in the educational environment as any unwanted sexual attention from administrators, teachers, peers or school staff. The range of behaviors includes leering, pinching, grabbing, suggestive verbal comments, pressure for sexual activity, spreading sexual rumors, making sexual or sexist jokes, pulling at another student's clothing, cornering or brushing up against a student in a sexual way, epitaphs referring

to students' sexual orientation, date rape, and/or sexual graffiti about a student or engaging in any other actions of a sexual manner that might create a hostile learning environment.

In 1993, the American Association of University Women (AAUW) conducted a study of sexual harassment in public schools. Over 75% of the girls and 66% of the boys said they had been the target of unwanted sexual comments, jokes, gestures or looks. Sixty-six percent of the girls and 42% of the boys reported having been touched, grabbed or pinched. Student-to-student harassment was the most common, accounting for 80% of the harassment, while teachers, custodians and coaches were responsible for 20%.

Myra and David Sadker (1994) claim that a hostile school setting discourages girls from fully participating in their own education and leads them to devalue themselves and their academic potential. This may lead to a host of academic and discipline problems such as failing grades and class cutting.

Boys often receive mixed messages about sexual harassment. In too many schools athletes receive subtle and sometimes overt approval from fathers, male coach and peers that sowing their wild oats" is a perfectly normal, macho behavior. This is often seen as approval for behaviors ranging from unwanted touching to date rapes and "gang bangs" (Gelman & Rogers, 1993).

School administrators may be inconsistent in dealing with sexual harassment between students, and even between faculty and students. From our personal observations, we would guess that there are few high schools, within any given five to ten year period, where at least one faculty member has not had sexual

relations with a student. Most often, even though the affair is known by others, it is either unreported to authorities or the authorities quietly end it without any publicity or punishment for the educator.

The high levels of sexual harassment in schools, especially when boys victimize girls, create the potential for violence. When boys think that it is manly to touch, feel, grope and forcibly have sex with girls, there may be an exponential affect on school violence in general. If a school creates a climate in which peer approval of sexual harassment is significantly reduced, the likelihood for reinforcement lessens.

Prevention of sexual harassment should include clear guidelines and educational programs which sensitize students and faculty to causes and consequences of sexual harassment for both victims and victimizers. Curricula should be developmentally appropriate and offer an adequate number of concrete examples.

School staff should develop system wide plans for employee and student training and guidelines to help students who have been sexually harassed. Staff and students need to understand their rights and responsibilities and should become aware of appropriate responses to harassment. Such a plan will enable students to identify their legal and administrative options for responding to sexual harassment.

Staff and student training should be aimed at prevention and may be accomplished through formal curricula, video tapes and role playing. Staff should be trained to recognize early signs of sexually harassing behavior, whether between students or faculty and students, and to intervene.

Students should be trained to respond effectively to sexual harassment. Responses may include (1) talking to a friend, counselor, or relative about the situation in order to place the facts in perspective and develop solutions, (2) learning not to laugh at the harassing behavior, (3) learning skills to confront the harasser with a firm NO at the first sign of sexual harassment and letting the harasser know that this behavior will not be tolerated, (4) avoiding being alone with harassers, (5) talking with other students to see if they have been harassed and if so petitioning school authorities to deal with the problem, (6) obtaining eye witnesses to verify experiences of harassment, (7) keeping a written record documenting all incidents with dates, times, places, ad persons who have seen the activity and recording physical and emotional reactions, and (8) filing complaints.

Summary and Conclusion

My twenty years of studying the issues discussed have convinced me that there is a real problem of punitiveness in our society. Cross cultural and cross societal data support my conclusions. As a nation, we seem to have short memories. We look for simple answers and are prone to turn to visions of a past that never existed in order to recreate simplistic solutions which never worked.

Our schools have to struggle with punitive, scientifically discredited and outmoded approaches to problems of student misbehavior, partly because of public policies and legislation promoted by right wing ideologies. Further, it is unrealistic to expect that most educators do not reflect the punitive attitudes

of society at large. As mentioned, even psychologists tend to reflect those attitudes, despite their training. So just how bad is the situation?

Despite the evidence about our levels of punitiveness, we are changing as a society. Many policy makers, including judges, legislators, criminologists, police and educators, over the years, have recognized the causes of misbehavior and violence rather than promoting and extolling "get tough" policies. Child abuse laws, protection from spousal abuse, drug treatment programs, juvenile justice and the schools have gradually moved away from our punitive roots.

As mentioned, polls reflect a slow but discernible erosion of support for hitting children. This is in part the result of the works of practicing psychologists who base their approaches on behavioral research. For instance, just twenty years ago few educators and even fewer parents knew about or used timeout as a the major punishment techniques with toddlers or young students. Now the term is part of our national lexicon of child rearing techniques. School psychologists have done their part in this movement.

In 1994 about 60 to 70% of Americans support parental spanking (Straus, 1994). Most states do not allow spanking of foster children. Currently, only 23 states still allow paddling in schools. As of 1994, all but a few of the national organizations representing children in any setting had taken a stand against corporal punishment in the schools and some, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, are reconsidering their positions on parental spanking.

Schools still remain one of the safest havens for young people, despite some pockets of violence. We know what has to be done to limit any violence among youth, but as a nation we are unwilling or unable to commit the resources necessary for change.

As school psychologists we have already proven what we can do, but we must do more. In ending, I urge you to become more proactive about the issues I have discussed here. Now is the time to act. As our role in assessment continues to get a bad rap, we have no choice but to make schools and the public aware of what we have to offer in the areas of prevention and treatment of school and home misbehavior (Hyman, Dahbany, Blum, Weiler, Brooks-Klein & Pokalo, 1996).

Altemeyer, B. (1988). Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

American Association of University Women (1993). Hostile hallways. A national survey conducted by Louis Harris & Associates.

American Psychological Association, (1993). Violence and youth:Psychology's response. Volume 1: Summary report of the American Psychological Association Commission on Violence and Youth.

Aries, P. (1962). Centuries of childhood: A social history of family life (Translated by Robert Baldick. New York: Alfred A.

Axelrod, S. & Apsche, J. (1984). The effects of punishment on human behavior. New York: Academic Press.

Barrish, B. (1996). The relationship of remembered parental physical punishment to adolescent self concept. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Barnhart, J. (1972). The Billy Graham religion. Philadelphia: The Pilgrim Press

Berna, J. (1993). The worst experiences of adolescents from divorced and separated parents and the stress responses to those experiences. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Berna, J., & Hyman, I. (April 17, 1993). Stress responses of children from divorced and separated families. Paper presented at the 25th Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, Washington, D.C.

Blum, M. (1994). The pre-service teacher's educational training in classroom discipline: A national survey of teacher educational programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Bongiovanni, A. (1979). An analysis of research on punishment and its relation to the use of corporal punishment in the schools. In I. Hyman and J. Wise,(Eds.)Corporal punishment in American education.Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Brassard, M. & Hart, S. (1989). Development and validation of operationally defined measures of emotional maltreatment. Research workshop presented at the Eighth National Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect, Salt Lake City.

Brassard, M., Hart, S. & Germain, B. (1987). Psychological Maltreatment of Children and Youth. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press.

California Department of Justice, Division of Law Enforce-

ment (1993). Profile 1992, Sacramento, CA.

Chandler, L. (1983). The Stress Response: An instrument for use in assessing emotional adjustment reactions. School Psychology Review, 12, 260-265.

Chicago Public Schools, The Bureau of Safety and Security (1994). Annual Report. Chicago, Ill.

Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers (1992). Hartford, CN: Connecticut Advisory Panel for Teacher Professional Standards: Connecticut State Department of Education

Children's Defense Fund (1991). Child poverty in America. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund.

Connecticut Advisory Council for Teacher Professional Stan dards. (1993). Code of Professional Responsibility for Teacher. Hartford, CN: State of Connecticut Department of Education.

Dise, J. , Iyer, C. & Debler, M. (1995). Searches of students, lockers and automobiles, Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.

Elam, S. (June, 1989). The second annual Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa poll of teacher's attitudes toward the public school. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, (10), 785-798.

Elam S. & Rose, & L. (Sept. 1995). The 27th annual Phi Delta Kappan poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools.Phi Delta Kappan, 77(1), 41-59.

Elliot, M. (April 18, 1994). Crime and punishment. Newsweek, 18-22.

Finkelstein, B. (1989). Governing the young: Teacher behavior in popular primary schools in the 19th century United States. New York: The Falmer Press.

Gelman, D. & Rogers, P. (April 12, 1993). Mixed messages. Newsweek, 121(15), 28-29.

Greven, P. (1980). The Protestant temperament. New York: Alfred Knopf, Inc.

Greven, P. (1991).Spare the child: The religious roots of punishment and the psychological impact of physical abuse. New York: Knopf.

Hart, S. (1987). Psychological maltreatment in schooling. School Psychology Review, 16 (2), 169-180.

Hart, S. & Brassard, M. (1987). A major threat to children's mental health: Psychological maltreatment. American Psychologist , 42(2), 160-165.

Hyman, I. (1987). Psychological correlates of corporal punishment and physical abuse.In M.Brassard, S.Hart & B. Germain (Eds.) Psychological Maltreatment of Children and Youth. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press.

Hyman, I. (1989). Time out: How to use it without getting sued. Education Oasis, 4(5), 11-13.

Hyman, I. (1990). Reading, writing and the hickory stick: The appalling story of physical and psychological abuse of American school children. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books.

Hyman, I. (1995). Corporal punishment, psychological maltreatment, violence and punitiveness in America: Research, advocacy and public policy.Journal of Applied and Preventive Psychology, 4, 113-130.

Hyman, I. & D'Allesandro, J. (1984). Good old fashioned discipline: The politics of punitiveness. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 39-45.

Hyman, I., Dahbany, A., Blum, M., Weiler, E., Brooks-Klein, V. & Pokalo, M. (1996). School discipline and school violence:The teacher variance approach, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn 7 Bacon.

Hyman, I. & Lally, D. (1982). The effectiveness of staff development programs to improve school discipline. Urban Review, 14(3), 181-196.

Hyman, I., Olbrich, J., & Shanock, A. (1994). A perspective on violence: Reasons, trends and solutions. address presented at the 1994 Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, Seattle, WA.

Hyman & Pokalo, (1993). Spanking, paddling and child abuse: The problem of punitiveness in America. Paper presented at the Eighth Biennial National Symposium on Child Victimization, Coordinated by Children's National Medical Center, Washington, D.C.

Hyman, I. & Weiler, E. (Nov. 20, 1993). Emotional maltreatment in schools: Definition, incidence and Legal Implications. Paper presented at the 39th Annual Convention of the National Organization on Legal Problems in Education, Philadelphia.

Hyman, I. & Wise, J. (1979). Corporal punishment in American education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hyman, I., Zelikoff, W. & Clarke, J. (1988). Psychological and physical abuse in schools: A paradigm for understanding post-traumatic stress disorder in children. Journal of traumatic Stress, 243-267.

Kaplan, J. (1995). Psychologists' attitudes towards corporal punishment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Kohr, M. (1995). Validation of my worst experience survey. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Lambert, C. (1990). Factorial structure and reliability of a scale measuring stress responses as a result of maltreatment in schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Lambert, C., Witkowski, B., Hyman, I., Alderman, L., & Tucker, E. (1988). Psychological and physical abuse in the schools: A survey of students. Paper presented at the 20th Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists.

Los Angeles Unified Public Schools- Department of Security (1994). Annual Report. Los Angeles, CA.

McCord, J. (1991). Questioning the value of punishment.Social Problems,38, 167-179.

Miller, A. (1980). For your own good. New York: Farer, Straus & Giraux.

Moles, O. (Ed.) (1990). Student discipline strategies. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

National Center for Education Statistics (April, 1992). Public school district survey on safe, disciplined and drug-free schools. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Department of education- Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Commission on Children (1991). Beyond rhetoric:A new American agenda for children and families. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office

Russell, W. (1988).Analysis of OCR data from 1978-1986. Unpublished paper, Philadelphia: NCSCPAS, Temple University.

National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse (1991a). Public attitudes and behaviors with respect to child abuse prevention, 1987-1991. Chicago: NCPCA.

National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse (1991b). Current trends in child abuse reporting and fatalities: The results of the 1990 annual fifty states survey. Chicago: NCPCA.

National Institute of Education. (1978). Violent schools, safe schools: The safe school study report to the congress. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents.

New Jersey v. T.L.O.,469 U.S. 325,382, n.25 (1985) (Stevens, J. dissenting)

Newman, J. (1980). From past to future: School violence in a broad view. Contemporary Education, 52(1), 8.

Patterson, G., Capaldi, D. & Bank, L. (1990). An early starter model for predicting delinquency. In D. Pepler & K. Rubin, (Eds.). The development and treatment of childhood aggression. (pp. 139-168). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pokalo, M. (1986). Caregivers' attitudes toward the severity of punishment for forty-four misbehaviors in mental retardation institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Pokalo, M. & Hyman, I. (1993). Case studies in community sanctioned abuse of school children. Paper presented at the 25th Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, Washington, D.C.

Ragsdale, E. (1994). Ethical beliefs and professional practices of psychologists regarding parental use of corporal punishment. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Ruble, W. (1977, November 13). Harrisburg debates show-swatting. Oregonian.

Russell, W. (1988). Analysis of OCR data from 1978-1986. Unpublished paper, Philadelphia, NCSCPAS, Temple University.

Russell, W. (1989) The OCR data on corporal punishment: What does it really mean? Paper presented at the Third National Conference on Abolishing Corporal Punishment in the Schools, Sponsored by the National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse, Chicago, Ill.

Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1994). Failing at fairness: How America's schools cheat girls. New York: Charles Scribners & Sons.

Sakowski, L (1993). A study of pre and post-trauma adjustment in corporally punished students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Sarno, G. G.(1992). Emotional distress by school teacher or administrator. 18 Am Jur Proof of Fact 3rd, 103, (1992).

Stefkovich, J. (Nov. 21, 1993a). Strip searching in the wake of Williams, Cornfield and Widener: Reactions to the concern for school safety. Paper presented at the Convention of the national Organization on Legal Problems in Education, Philadelphia, PA.

Stefkovich, J. (April 15, 1993b). School safety and fourth amendment rights : Legal and policy perspectives.Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Straus, M.A. (1994). Beating the Devil Out Of Them: Corporal Punishment in American Families. New York: Lexington

Books.

Straus, M. & Mathur, A. ((Sept. 23, 1994). Social change and trends in approval of corporal punishment by parents from 1968 to 1994. Paper presented at the International Symposium on Violence in Childhood and Adolescence, University of Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany.

Tipper, et al. v. The New Castle Area School District, et al.; Civil Action No. 93-0501. In United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, 1993.

Trudel, L. (1994). A study of pre- and post-trauma adjustment in corporally punished students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). Reaching the goals-Goal 6: Safe, disciplined and drug-free schools. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1994). Child Maltreatment 1992: Reports form the States to the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice (1991). Teenage Victims: A National Crime Survey Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice (1992). Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1990. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice (1993). Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1991. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice (1994). Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1992. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vargas-Moll, I. (1991). A descriptive study of school induced stressors among Hispanic students. Unpublished dissertation, Temple University.

Vargas-Moll, I. & Hyman, I. (March 6, 1992). Psychological and physical maltreatment of inner city Hispanic school children. Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual Conference on the Future of Psychology in the Schools, Sponsored by the School Psychology Program, Temple University.

White, J. & Hyman, I. (Oct. 30, 1994). A survey of public school administrators regarding the use of strip searches in Pennsylvania schools. Paper presented at the Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Philadelphia,

PA.

Wiehe, E. (1990). Religious influence of parental attitudes toward the use of corporal punishment. Journal of Family Violence, 5(2). 182-184.

Zelikoff, W. (1990).A retrospective study of school related stressors of educators Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.